FBI-Commission

To Quin Shea from Harold Weisberg, JFK assassination appeals 10/2/79
Ting assassination appeals-
"Substantive" added notations

This also relates to the problems from the FBI's self-serving, cover-the Bureau paper.

Attached will be (after the copier is repaired) the Not Recorded 62-109090 Rosen to Belmont memo of 9/10/64 and the N.O. 9/11/64 airtel, 105-82555-4951, the copy also Not Recorded in the 62-109090 file.

The airtel has a notation added, seemingly innocent and without substance. Yet to a subject expert it is of substance.

At this time in September 1964 the Commission's Report was in page proof and it was working on illuminating it and preparing the 26 supplemental volumes.

The Commission had some knowledge that Oswald had used the 544 Camp Street return address on the pamphlet he'd bought from the Fair Play for Cuba Committee but in providing the Commission with copies the FBI had NOT provided that particular copy.

The Commission knew that the CIA-organized and funded Cuban Revolutionary Council had had offices in that building. It knew much less than the FBI could have told it of other offices in that building. To a degree I brought these matters and what the FBI hid and how in my Oswald in New Orleans, in 1967.

As it prepared for publication the Commission decided it had to publish the Oswald use of this address. It got nowhere with the FBI in its effort to get a xerox of the pamphlet with the 544 Camp Street address, as the Commission records show.

Despite the airtel attached and the note added, the Secret Service knew well what the Commission wanted and provided a copy, the copy the Commission published.

The note which appears to be innocent isn't. It is false in saying that "none contain address of 544 Camp St." The FBI copy with this address is disclosed in the general releases and earlier it was given to Paul Koch, when he persisted with the FBI.

An FOIA analyst or you acting on appeal may not know the actualities and may regard the note as without substance. I believe that any false statement of this nature is quite substantive. If I can't tell you why the FBI lied I can tell you that it did.

To a subject expert the lie does not stand alone. As soon as the FBI in New Orleans learned that the Secret Service was investigating Oswald's literature distribution it phoned FBIHQ, which leaned on Secret Service headquarters and got it to terminate its interest and to direct its New Orleans office to terminate its investigation. In this way the FBI assured a non-investigation and misled the Commission and withheld from it. I remind you of the prior appeals relating to the Doyle, Martin(Minneapolis) and WHSO films and the relevant records that leave without doubt that Oswald had an associate the FBI did not locate or identify. My appeal relating to the fingerprint not Oswald's also is relevant. (You have not acted on any of these appeals and the FBI

has provided a copy of the Doyle file only and that only when it was providing a copy to a later requester.)

Going along with this is the absence of any FBI records relating to Oswald in New Orleans or any of my books published after 1966. I recall no reference to any in the JFK records or those provided in response to my PA request. Given the FBI's interest in my first two books and its scheme to sue me to "stop" me and my writing it does not appear likely that it had no interest in any of my later books, particularly not where I was so critical of it, as over this 544 Camp Street matter and what it did not tell the Commission.

It is my belief that the missing information is in other and unsearched files. Prior appeals refer to some that can hold withheld information.

Voluminous as the records provided are they cannot be all, as my recent examination of the earliest assassination file (62-109060) Sections makes clear. I will be writing you about this separately when I can attach copies. This will include reference to records not provided in the file.

As the FBI foreclosed the Secret Service, so also did it have its own ways of foreclosing the Commission. When the field reported that the Commission was interviewing witnesses the FBI had interviewed the FBI merely told the Commission it would not "waste" its time for the Commission if the Commission were to duplicate its work. Because the Commission depended on the FBI it ceased separate interviews. To illustrate there is the 544 Camp Street matter and what the Commission did not do about it and there are such things as the FBI interviewing a witness seven times but filing only two reports of two of the interviews. The Commission learned of the other five interviews only when it was deposing that witness.

The FOIA problem is not a simple one. I believe there is no solution except by providing any and all seemingly duplicate copies. And, of course, searching unsearched files.